



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/821,795

04/09/2004

Laith Alsarraf

068983-001

9336

7590 09/26/2007
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
Suite 3400
2049 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/821,795 | Applicant(s) ALSARRAF ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Backhean Tiv | Art Unit 2151 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/9/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2151

Detailed Action

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Drawings

The Drawings filed on 4/9/04 are acceptable.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/2/2005 has been considered

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-8,10-15,17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,199,102 issued to Cobb in view of US Patent issued to McCormick et al.(McCormick).

As per claim 1, Cobb teaches a spam blocking system comprising: an approved sender list configured to store information identifying a plurality of senders that have been approved to send emails to a recipient(col.7, lines 59-67); and a processing system configured to: receive an incoming email from a sender to the recipient(col.2, lines 25-46); determine whether information identifying the sender is in the approved

Art Unit: 2151

sender list(col.7,lines 63-67); if information identifying the sender is not in the approved sender list, direct the sender to take a test configured to only be passable with input from an individual(col.5,lines 24-54); determine whether the sender has passed the test(col.5,lines 24-54); and if the sender has passed the test, place information identifying the sender in the approved sender list(col.5,lines 24-54,col.8,lines 1-41).

Cobb does not explicitly teaches an approved sender database.

McCormick explicitly teaches an approved sender database(Fig.1, Fig.3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Cobb to include an approved sender database as taught by McCormick in order to filter unwanted email(McCormick, col.1,lines 10-13).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Cobb and McCormick in order to filter unwanted email(McCormick, col.1,lines 10-13).

As per claim 3, the system of Claim 1 wherein the processing system is configured to ask the recipient whether to place information identifying the sender in the approved sender database before placing the information identifying the sender in the approved sender database(Cobb, col.7, lines 53-col.8, lines 47).

As per claim 4, the system of Claim 1 wherein the processing system is configured to deliver the email to the recipient if the sender passes the test(Cobb, col.7, lines 53-col.8, lines 47).

As per claim 5, the system of Claim 1 wherein the processing system is configured to redirect or block the email from reaching the recipient if the sender does not pass the test(Cobb, col.3,lines 41-67)

As per claim 6, the system of Claim 1 wherein the processing system is configured to deliver the email to the recipient if information identifying the sender is in the approved sender database(Cobb, col.7, lines 53-col.8, lines 47).

As per claim 7, the system of Claim 1 further including a blocked sender database configured to store information identifying a plurality of senders that are to be blocked from sending emails to the recipient and wherein the processing system is configured to: determine whether information identifying the sender is in the blocked sender database(Cobb, col.8, lines 35-41); and if information identifying the sender is in the blocked sender database, not to direct the sender to take the test and to redirect or block the email from reaching the recipient(Cobb, col.8, lines 35-41).

As per claims 8,10-15,17-21, do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1,3-7. Therefore claims 8,10-15,17-21 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 2, 9, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,199,102 issued to Cobb in view of US Patent issued to McCormick et al.(McCormick) in further view of US 7,149,801 issued to Burrows et al.(Burrows).

Cobb in view of McCormick does not explicitly teach as per claim 2, the system of Claim 1 wherein the test is to enter characters appearing against a partially-obscuring background on a webpage.

Art Unit: 2151

Burrows teaches wherein the test is to enter characters appearing against a partially-obscuring background on a webpage(col.3, lines 15-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Cobb in view of McCormick include the test is to enter characters appearing against a partially-obscuring background on a webpage as taught by Burrows in order to reduce spam on a computer network(Burrows, col.1, lines 14-22).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Cobb, McCormick, and Burrows in order to reduce spam on a computer network(Burrows, col.1, lines 14-22).

As per claims 9,16, do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 2. Therefore claims 9,16 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2151

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571) 272-5654. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BT
Backhean Tiv
2151
9/19/07


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100